

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

PAYROLL FUNDING COMPANY LLC, a  
Nevada limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

ATLANTIC CONSTRUCTION GROUP  
(ACG) LLC, a Michigan limited liability  
company; ASSURED SOURCE, INC., a  
Delaware corporation; ASSURED SOURCE  
ASO, LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
company; PBC GROUP LLC, a New York  
limited liability company; PHOENIX  
BUILDING CORP., a New York corporation;  
JAMES A. D'IORIO, an Individual; THOMAS  
D'IORIO, an Individual; THOMAS  
ATAMANOFF, an Individual; and DOES I  
through X and ROE CORPORATIONS I  
through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:11-cv-00943-APG-NJK

**ORDER AMENDING ORDER GRANTING  
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT,  
NUNC PRO TUNC**

On February 28, 2012, the Court entered an Order (Dkt. no. 13) granting Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(d), finding Defendants' failure to oppose the motion constituted consent to its granting. Under recent Ninth Circuit authority, a district court may not grant summary judgment based solely on a "deemed admitted"<sup>1</sup> local rule.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the local rule at issue in *Heinemann* and here, the district court may "deem a non-movant's failure to respond a complete abandonment of its opposition to summary judgment;" in other words, the failure to file an opposition constitutes "consent to the granting of the motion." District of Nevada Local Rule 7-2(d).

1 *See Heinemann v. Satterberg*, No. 12–35404, 2013 WL 5312568 \*3 (9th Cir., Sept. 24, 2013). In  
2 *Heinemann*, the Ninth Circuit held that “a motion for summary judgment may not be granted  
3 based on a failure to file an opposition to the motion, regardless of any local rule that suggests the  
4 contrary.” *Id.* at \*2.

5 Although legally sound at the time of the granting of the motion, the efficacy of the  
6 district court’s order has now been called into question by the Ninth Circuit’s opinion in  
7 *Heinemann*. Simply, it has now been clarified that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 “prohibits  
8 the grant of summary judgment ‘by default even if there is a complete failure to respond to the  
9 motion.’” *Id.* at \*3 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. Advisory Notes (2010)). In the interest of judicial  
10 economy and preventing remand on appeal, the Court is forced to re-examine the merits of the  
11 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. Therefore, the prior Order is amended to include the  
12 following:

### 13 I. DISCUSSION

14 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide for summary adjudication when the  
15 pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the  
16 affidavits, if any, show that “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is  
17 entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Material facts are those that may  
18 affect the outcome of the case. *See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).  
19 Factual disputes whose resolution would not affect the outcome of the suit are irrelevant to the  
20 consideration of a motion for summary judgment. *Id.* A dispute as to a material fact is genuine if  
21 there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to return a verdict for the nonmoving party. *Id.*  
22 “Summary judgment is inappropriate if reasonable jurors, drawing all inferences in favor of the  
23 nonmoving party, could return a verdict in the nonmoving party’s favor.” *Diaz v. Eagle Produce*  
24 *Ltd. P’ship*, 521 F.3d 1201, 1207 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *United States v. Shumway*, 199 F.3d  
25 1093, 1103–04 (9th Cir. 1999)).

26 In determining a summary judgment motion, the Court may consider only admissible  
27 evidence. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); *Beyene v. Coleman Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 854 F.2d 1179, 1181 (9th  
28

1 Cir. 1988). To be admissible, proper foundation must be laid and documents must be  
2 authenticated. *Id.*; *Canada v. Blain's Helicopters, Inc.*, 831 F.2d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 1987). In a  
3 summary judgment motion, documents authenticated through personal knowledge must be  
4 "attached to an affidavit that meets the requirements of [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 56(e) and the affiant  
5 must be a person through whom the exhibits could be admitted into evidence." *Canada*, 831 F.2d  
6 at 925.

7 Plaintiff seeks summary judgment on the first claim for breach of contract against all  
8 Defendants. In support of the motion, Plaintiff offers the allegedly breached contracts, a purchase  
9 agreement between ARRT Receivables, Inc. ("ARRT") and Payroll Funding Company, LLC  
10 ("Payroll") selling ARRT's right of payment under the alleged breached contracts to Payroll, and  
11 the declarations of Demlar Janovec (President of ARRT) and William R. Robins (managing  
12 member of Payroll).

13 Having reviewed the proffered exhibits, the Court finds there is no genuine issue of  
14 material fact precluding summary judgment. Defendants were parties and sureties of several  
15 different loan agreements ("Agreements") with both ARRT and Payroll. ARRT and Payroll  
16 entered into a contract whereby ARRT sold its rights to payment and to pursue loan repayment  
17 under the Agreements to Payroll. Defendants failed to completely repay the loans pursuant to the  
18 Agreements.

19 The Agreements and the affidavits combined establish the amount of each Defendant's  
20 liability and the attorney's fees due to Plaintiff in pursuing the collection of the monies owed  
21 under the Agreements. Under the Agreements, after applying payments made, Payroll Funding  
22 Company LLC is entitled to judgment against Phoenix Building Corp. in the amount of  
23 \$214,742.93; against Atlantic Construction Group (ACG) LLC in the amount of \$22,087.25;  
24 against PBC Group LLC in the amount of \$35,890.05; against Thomas D'Iorio in the amount of  
25 \$250,632.98; against James D'Iorio in the amount of \$214,742.93; against Thomas Atamanoff in  
26 the amount of \$186,342.37; and against Assured Source PEO, LLC in the amount of \$250,632.98.  
27 Moreover, pursuant to the breached Agreements, Defendants Phoenix Building Corp., Atlantic  
28

1 Construction Group (ACG) LLC, PBC Group LLC, Thomas D'Iorio, James D'Iorio, Thomas  
2 Atamanoff, and Assured Source PEO, LLC are jointly and severally liable to pay Plaintiffs'  
3 attorney's fees in the amount of \$17,973.88 incurred through December 31, 2011.

4 **II. CONCLUSION**

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court's prior Order is amended to include the  
6 analysis herein. The Judgment remains unaffected.

7  
8 DATED THIS 18<sup>th</sup> day of November 2013.

9  
10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 ANDREW P. GORDON  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28